

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/953,154	10/17/97	KOZAK	K 450.154US1

MM51/1210
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

PATEL, J

ART UNIT**PAPER NUMBER**

2835

DATE MAILED: 12/10/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/953,154	Applicant(s) Keith A. Kozak, Charles T. Dammon, Anton R. Pool
Examiner JAGDISH PATEL	Group Art Unit 2835

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 17, 1997

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2- 1 FORM

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention..

1. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “a device” is indefinite in claims, it is not clear what type of device applicant referring to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art how to make the keyboard for a computer. A connector disposed with in the housing and receptive to corresponding connector of “a device” such that the device communicates with the computer over the communications link when the connectors are coupled. Applicant claims a connector for device to communicates with computer through communications link, not a device.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2835

Claims 1-6, 10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson et al. Richardson et al. disclose a apparatus having a housing 12, plurality of keys 33, communication link 24, 25, and connector connected to communication links shown in the fig-2, to devices 14,15, cardle cavity 13,17, is shaped so that device fit in to cavity as claimed with a surface of the device exposed in to cavity as shown in fig-2, While Richardson et al. does not explicitly teach a power source and group of personal digital device, it is recognized that power supplies are inherent in the design of all computer devices. A claim is anticipated if each element of the claim is found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, or that the claimed invention was previously known or embodied in a single prior art device or practice.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Willett. Willett discloses a computer 18 with a processor 48 and first wireless transceiver 62, keyboard 26 is communicatively coupled to the computer, and connection 20, 22 (see, for example column 3, line 26-30) removably couples the device to the keyboard when docked. Willet further includes charger 112 to recharge battery 82 of the device. While Willett does not explicitly teach a computer memory and controller, it is recognized that such components are inherent in the design of all computer devices. A claim is anticipated if each element of the claim is found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, or that the claimed invention was previously known or embodied in a single prior art device or practice.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. With respect to claims 16-18, it is noted that Richardson et al. teaches the use of various devices mounted in cardle portions of the keyboard. While the specific devices claimed are not shown in Richardson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount any known and conventional electronic device in a cardle area with electrical connections in view of teachings of Richardson et al. There is no unobviousness in any of a number of devices being mounted in cardle portions as exemplified by the variety of known devices applicant lists in claim 16.

Claims 7-9, 11-13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. as applied to claims 1, 6, 11 and 17 above, and further in view of Toda. Regarding to claims 7-9, 11 and 13 Richardson et al. lacks a keyboard having universal serial bus-compatible cable, radio frequency transceiver, recharger, battery, personal digital device communicate in docking mode when connectors are coupled and in stand alone mode via wireless transceiver of the device. Toda teaches a mobile telephone system capable of adapting a portable telephone set including a various types of cables, a radio frequency transceiver, a

Art Unit: 2835

recharger, a battery (shown in fig- 1, 4) and the device communicates in docking mode when connectors are coupled and in stand alone mode via wireless transceiver of the device when connectors are uncoupled. Regarding the universal serial bus-compatible cable used by applicant, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a conventional universal serial bus-compatible cable instead of cabling of Richardson et al. cable for better communication between the devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the docking structure of Toda in to the housing and personal digital device of the Richardson et al. apparatus to maintain electrical communication in docking mode when connectors are coupled and in stand alone mode via wireless transceiver of the device when connectors are uncoupled thus adding greater versatility to the device of Richardson et al.

Regarding to claims 12 and 19 applicant discloses in specification (page 6, line 16-21) personal digital assistant device could be a telephone handset, a television remote control, etc., as well as other consumer electronics devices., however Today teaches a portable telephone set 21 as a personal digital assistant device; however, Toda does not specifically mention that the device should be a US Robotics Pilot, however takes official notice as to the types of personal digital assistants being known equivalents. there is no unobviousness in the PDA being any conventional known type such as a US Robotics Pilot. The personal digital assistant device is a convenient organizer, data storage and data transfer system, it can communicate with the computer from touch screen, key and remotely away from the computer device. It would have

Art Unit: 2835

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a personal digital assistant device as taught by Toda in the device of Richardson et al. to enhance the features of Richardson et al.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Goodman et al. Richardson et al. lacks a touch screen and changeable virtual key on touch screen. Goodman et al. teaches a portable computer structure having a computer tablets 22 includes a screen which is written with an RF probe 23 to input commands and data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the portable computer display structure of Goodman et al. in to the personal digital device display of Richardson et al device to provide more convenience and control from display screen.


Claims 20, 21 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willett as applied to claims 22 and 23 above, and further in view of Goodman et al. Willett lacks a touch screen and changeable virtual key on touch screen. Goodman et al. teaches a portable computer structure having a computer tablets 22 includes a screen which is written with an RF probe 23 to input commands and data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the portable computer structure of Goodman et al. in to the display of Willett hand held computer to provide more convenience and control from the display screen.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2835

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Petteruti et al., Grant, Bradbury, Wright, Stoye and Allen disclose different type of structure for computer system.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner Jagdish Patel should be directed to whose telephone number is (703) 305-0930. The examiner can normally be reached on "Monday-Friday" from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on (703) 308-0538.



Jagdish Patel

Patent examiner

12/01/1998



LYNN D. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER